

M 1947

Group I

Tuesday October 20, 1970

BARN

MR. NYLAND: We're getting closer and closer to the deadline. Next week, Tuesday will be on my birthday. It will be considered an ordinary day. And we will have a meeting at the end of the day.

Do we have to stand?

(CHARLOTTE GILMAN: I'm sitting on a cement block, Mr. Nyland.)

MR. NYLAND: Oh. Certainly looks like a little throne.

So I have been thinking; what will I do now, after I don't have anymore Tuesdays, regarding discussions of the Monday group? And of course the same applies to the Thursdays which I usually discuss on Friday. That can still take place, but perhaps it's right and perhaps it isn't. Every once in a while I feel I don't have enough contact. Because what is the situation? I listen to the tapes the next day. Usually I start out with the aftermeeting and make a few notes. And then there comes the big meeting, the meeting itself, and I make a few notes again. Such notes I send to the moderator. In the evening I try to remember some of the sequence of certain questions and also what answers were given. And I hope then, that in general, it will be understood since perhaps most of it would be for the nucleus.

But then there may be certain questions which were asked, which in my opinion were not sufficiently elucidated; or where even, I thought, that there may be something missing. And then if I say that it might be of benefit to the person who

answered the question, but not particularly to the person who asked it - and how will I everbridge this? I will try, perhaps for next week even, to make not only notes, but to dictate an answer. And if I don't make it too long, that then it can be listened to at the subsequent Monday evening or Thursday, so that then the group as a whole can hear it. And treating it, then, exactly the same as the way we do with meetings from other cities, who are also answered in a similar--similar way and where I then, of course, am not present but try to be present by means of a few answers. And we may try that.

I would also suggest to the nucleus - it will be a little bit more time-consuming but it will be much more to the point - if they could, at the aftermeeting, listen to their own meeting - and then stop whenever they want to discuss it - because so often they don't remember exactly how certain things were worded and even how their answer was - or whatever was the tone of the question. And although they have tried a few times to play back one particular question that I know, I don't think it is sufficient for them to come to conclusions. And of course what I have in mind is really that they come to conclusions which are acceptable for all the members of that nucleus. So that it more and more could become a united front regarding certain questions to be answered in a certain way in accordance with exact language and principles. We fail in that way every once in a while; and then I start to hesitate, because then I say - is it too soon that I stop? The different things that indicate that I should stop, I think, weigh heavier than the ether.

And by the way, I want to straighten out a few things that might have crept in; or that perhaps even some of you do not know, maybe because you came in later. And at the time when I did discuss the purpose of FIREFLY that you may not know exactly what I have in mind. Because the erroneous idea has come to my notice that I am going to publish. I just want you to know, so absolutely surely, that I never will publish any book. - That is, through a regular publisher and offer

it to the public for sale or for reading matter. The temptation isn't even there. I have absolutely no desire to make public what I have experienced - or even saying what I think Work means for a person. And of course although there is more than enough material that could fill several books, I have no desire whatsoever. And I will never allow anything to be published that we have talked about and I consider and can consider still my property - like tapes. That as long as I live they are not to be published at all. And I hope to leave instructions in my will that they will never be offered to the public.

I want to formulate certain things in a certain way, foregoing even the way they have been said; and eliminating every once in a while an emotional quality, which of course is there when one speaks. And that I will take some of the material we have talked about, particularly material that may be useful for the practical application of Work in daily life. And how to see, by means of tasks, that certain things could be mindful and reminding for a person who wishes to Work. And that of course the different subjects which have come up in our discussions over the last years, that they may be of some use. But only of some use to some people. And as long as I am still alive, I can guide it more or less by allowing these parts of FIREFLY which I hope we can continue now to start to continue to publish - where there is very small start, of course - when there is such a great deal of material. But maybe it is not necessary to publish too much. And that what I think ought to be published perhaps should even be condensed. And surely I should like to try to avoid repetition. But they are not open for the public. They are only to be read by certain people in a group who are honestly interested in Work. And they will not be given away just to satisfy curiosity. So as long as I am alive, I can guide that. When I have died, I will still ask some people I can trust to take care of that. I never wish it to have said that I in any way profit and have profit-- profited by means of such publication of the ideas of Gurdjieff. So I want to make

that particular condition very clear to all of you. I have no interest at all in any such thing.

Of course what I have in mind is exactly the same as what I have in mind with having groups and talking. And what I have in mind - and particularly when I say, almost jokingly, there is going to be a deadline - that I would like during this little period still to try to remember what may be useful for your daily life. And for that reason I've given a few tasks and I will give you again one today, because I believe you need it. You have had no particular education - neither for esoteric knowledge, nor for the wish even to know how to develop your inner life. At best it has been scattered because you have been interested in reading some books and also have talked a little. But it never has been sufficiently systematic unless you happen to become a student of certain things in certain directions. And I haven't seen any of that kind of a studious attitude.

So I--I wouldn't say I take it upon myself, but I do believe it is very necessary to remind you of your stupidities in daily life. And perhaps stupidity is a little too strong. It is really that you are thoughtless. And many times that you cannot be counted on. And many times also that you are forgetful and that you waste and that you do not take care of things the way I believe you should take care of them, particularly when it is not your property. That many times the attitude is much too superficial in ordinary life. And you can get along in ordinary life because really you are not put into prison by any authority. But I assure you, you put your inner life into prison because of your own behavior. And if you honestly want to free it, I think you have to learn what the attitude should be. So I take every once in a while a little bit of a characteristic which I believe applies to practically everybody.

I mean, for instance, how do you keep your word? When you make a promise. A promise which of course is understood by someone else - to whom the promise is made - that you will keep it. And also, in all probability, at the time when you

make it, that you wish to keep it; and you are fully convinced, maybe, that you will keep it. But you don't. You promise to phone someone at a certain time the next day - you don't. You promise to be at a certain place at a certain time - you are not there. You promise to get certain things or do certain things for someone else - you don't do it. And of course, I know, one rationalizes; and of course there are accidents and flat tires. And there are sometimes conditions which make you too tired and you oversleep. And sometimes you are just plain forgetful or superficial about it, that it doesn't matter if I don't do it now, I'll do it tomorrow just as good, because... and whatever the reasons are. So for one week I would like to give you a task which is extremely difficult for some of you. That is whenever you make any kind of a promise - that you keep it. And when it has to do with something that you cannot prevent - and is not to be foreseen, even - that you then make an attempt to say or to let another person know that it is impossible for you.

It's probably very strange because I do remember when I was your age; I promised at certain times, of course, to be home. And invariably without any question, driving back and forth from New York to Brewster it wouldn't matter at all where I was - and there were a couple of years where I drove back and forth from Buffalo to Brewster, and back again. I made a promise and whenever I could not keep it, at that time when I should have been home I would phone, regardless. And it is perhaps a little bit more stamped into me. Perhaps a little bit of that kind of indication - coming from my father and mother - for being exposed when I was young to such facts of truthfulness in ordinary life. And when I see that you don't live up to such principles which are so simple, I still think that you have to learn a great deal. And I can afford to tell it to you because I am older. Moreover I will have a birthday; and after that I can say almost anything because I will go into my 81st year - nine times nine; and it will be very interesting. So that whatever I say, you can then take for whatever you like. And you can criticize me, also, whichever way you wish because you can ascribe it to senility; and it won't hurt me in the least.

I was pleased today to hear part of a tape, from the West Coast, in reference to their attempts to bring activities to life in their group in San Francisco, and Sebastopol and the Land. And the meeting reported on that. And there was such beautiful description of how activity in one particular direction - of which there are now three or four - they have added a store - which is called the Hand Goods Store, and which has been in existence now for two weeks. In the first week they made fifty dollars and the second week a little over ninety - with very little material that they have at the present. But in the discussion it indicated so much that people, who have nothing in particular to do either with that store or with any other activity, felt that an activity in general is helpful to remind them of Work; and in such simple language and so honest and so truthful; and I was, I say, very happy.

We don't have that so much here. It's partly because we are a little larger and perhaps there is not as much contact possible. But it is also the caliber; and I don't want to mince any words about that. Because even in the activities in which we are engaged, you are still many times, quite superficial. When a store is supposed to be open, it's supposed to be open and attended to. It is not right that you take off time, maybe for lunch, and close the store. It is not right when one has to wait for an answer over the telephone when it rings five, six times; and then either one comes to the conclusion that no one is there or that someone is so busy.... When there are difficulties about the telephone and they don't ring loud enough, why don't you say certain things about that to have it corrected? When a person doesn't feel well, why don't you phone in? When a person during the day gets a little upset and leaves, why isn't it told with the proper reasons why?

If one promises to make certain things at a certain time, why don't you stick to it until you have done it?

All these little things - you might say I'm such a fuss-pot; and I hear that. And you might also say, why the hell does he spend such time on these little things? And I still tell you that the little things will count. And they will count very, very much in your Work, because if you become slipshod in ordinary affairs of ordinary life, you will never know exactly what is needed for the building of a Soul, if that could become your aim.

And many times, of course, the reasons that I want to listen to meetings sometimes from the beginning to end and spend the time like today - the whole day - with a few interruptions as you know - it's already an old story - practically impossible physically for me to listen to the different things that I ought to listen to and gradually trying to find out how can I shorten such times or perhaps become a little bit more efficient on my own part. How can I do justice to that what is being talked about in the name of Gurdjieff - because that is my aim. And that it is difficult - you, of course, you realize it - and it's not that I ask you now not to make it more difficult for me. It's quite honest when I say it doesn't matter. It is your affair and really becoming more and more your affair. I will not lose any sleep about it. And when I die I will not have any difficulty in dying.

You understand what I mean by these kind of little things - for groups to understand each other and to get out of your way a little bit once in a while to help when I talk about emotional relationships. When there are certain questions which you cannot solve - why don't you keep on asking time after time? When on Monday or on Thursday the questions are not solved, bring them up next week until you get someone who can help you to give you an answer.

What is still lacking? An understanding among the people who answer in the first place. In the second place, the usage of certain language which does not belong to new people and is very confusing. In the third place, too long explana-

things not knowing exactly which way to go and adding more and more words which do not belong. And in the fourth place, downright mistakes. So when I will answer such meetings, I will go and listen and stop and then talk and say what I think - with name - to the person who says this and that, who has not said the right thing as far as I believe Work must be understood, because I want this nucleus to be honest with themselves. And I want to make sure that the possibility of realizing and realization of that can exist; otherwise my advice again is - stop it and keep on reading ALL AND EVERYTHING. I do not know what Gurdjieff would think of that. As a matter of fact, I don't know at all what he would think of a meeting of this kind. I do not know what he thinks of me, and if I'm doing the right thing. To the extent that it is my Conscience and to the extent that it is sensitive, I will do, of course, the best I can in accordance with my own understanding of what I believe is right or wrong. And for that reason I will say that in my opinion it's useless to talk too much about things that cannot be understood.

There are questions, for instance, "impartiality," a word we have used thousands of times. Descriptions of an awareness by what? When we talk about 'I' we mean something. We mean in the first place it has to be created as a result of an effort. And the effort has to be the result of a real wish. When statements are made which do not belong, again I ask you - stop them. Tell them they're on the wrong road. Don't tell them, "You are going in the right direction," when they are not, because the direction they don't know. You establish a direction of talking about 'this is Work' in the way we understand it.

There are three ways of understanding Work. I thought I had explained it; and perhaps not so much about the so-called 'Third Way.' But I will tell it to you now again. One we call a little mental; that is, concepts in which we use words like "observation." We link them up with two other terms which do not primarily belong to the mind as it is. One is "impartiality," the other is "simultaneity." But we call it mental because we put certain things in certain terms so that mentally

they can be understood as a description of a method. And that "observation", of course, in this sense now has a very limited meaning. And that "impartiality" is, of course, a question of one's feeling: to become impartial with this what we call 'I'. And that "simultaneity" is a question of the understanding of time which our mind at the present time cannot understand. But we introduce a term called a 'Moment' which is not like a part of time but has a different property in itself having a property of Infinity. That is the mental approach and we call it 'A-B-C.'

There are many people who cannot understand a mental approach. They must have something else in order to feel that they are not only on the right road but also will reach a certain definite result. I've explained that it is more difficult, because in the first place when it is emotionally tinted it is not so easily subject to formulation. But then when one says 'presence to oneself', that presence is an Objective something - and you can use different terms, including God - to be present to your Self, in your manifestations. Not defining it, then only an indication of intuition as an emotional quality which gives you also knowledge of yourself, again translated then, in certain terminology of a mental kind, but reached only through a different road which we call 'emotional', simply as the presence of something existing with oneself when this personality behaves.

The question, of course, of being separate from that what one is as a personality is obvious because you cannot have anything Objective in the midst of subjectivity without protecting it. And when it has to function independently, something very special has to take place; and that can only be indicated as not having any contact with anything existing. But now you give that little something we call 'I,' when you want to define it, and we call it a presence when you don't want to define it - as something that has a different kind of quality because it is an Objective entity. It is present to you, functioning separate from any other kind of an organ within you; at the same time existing inside of you as if it is the voice of God which is not your voice but which sometimes becomes heard when one is in a kind of a state of receptivity or perhaps even sensitive.

These are the two different roads we have talked about before. I will come back to them a little later because I want to explain something else which I have not done very often. It is the constant being able to see oneself, even if that seeing is not immediately impartial, and even if in that process of recording a time element still appears. It belongs to a Self-study of a man in which he becomes familiar with himself. And it is particularly that kind of a method which becomes apparent when he grows older and reaches more and more maturity. I've used it as a certain description of the road to become an Obyavatel. And what it really is - simply it means for a man that he becomes free from his physical manifestations because in the light of the knowledge that he has acquired of himself - which as you know is more truthful than anything else he has ever had since he has been living with it, and gradually has learned to understand himself, you might even say, as being machine-like - he has lost during such a period the real caring for it in the sense of being proud. But he has learned to be able to see himself as free and able to fulfill a certain definite function.

If you want to emphasize the 'Obyavatel-ness' of a man - that he has dexterity; that he has an ability that even God Himself cannot tell him different when he is a simple man with that kind of mature knowledge. It is not knowledge that is reached by means of a mind thinking, or by means of a heart or a solar plexus feeling. It is a realization of his existence in an ability to do certain things in which there is no further doubt about himself. Not only that he can do it, but that what is being done is done correctly in accordance with the rules of Truth. For that reason, that kind of a method has to do mostly with his physical body. And the crux of that matter is freedom as a term which he then feels he has and not being bothered by anyone telling him differently because that, as freedom, he knows. That's all I want to say about this third form. But it is much more difficult even than the second. And for that, time is needed so that time can be lost in his experience. And only then, with definite maturity, will he be able to reach that kind of a state.

The emotional approach is more difficult because it cannot be formulated and you cannot even by arguing—argue—you cannot be—you cannot argue about it. It is also difficult because there is a relationship necessary between an emotional state and higher levels of Being, towards God, towards Infinity, towards higher forms of Being on different levels. That difficulty does not exist, as yet, with the mental approach. And the mind can only help to formulate because most of our attempts have to come from the wish which has to be honest.

Now what do we create? We make an attempt to create something which is very small, which is like an infant, which is like a couple of cells, almost not having a right to have a name. But what they do have, such cells, is a quality. So again we come to this particular problem of the quality and quantity.

And this now ought to be explained by using the word 'impartiality.' In the first place, it should be clear by this time that impartiality only belongs to this 'I' - or to that presence. And let's call the presence now a kind of an 'I' - which it is - with a definite quality which we call, to explain it emotionally, benevolence. It is a feeling, a relationship - a wish to share with a human being so that in that sharing, it can ultimately end up in a participation in the problems of his daily life by his personality and his unconsciousness.

We have now two qualities which we assign to these 'I's - if you wish, two; or if you wish - one, with two facets. One is the ability to record as a result of an observation process; giving us, in that little 'I', facts which are truthful, Objective, and absolute about ourselves. That this process continues while our ordinary unconscious processes continue. Some statements were made by someone in the group that he tried to go against his unconscious behavior. As soon as that was mentioned it should have been stopped so completely - immediately - that he had no chance to go further and try to explain it. A person remains unconscious with his personality regardless if an 'I' is there or an 'I' is not there. The creation of 'I' is an addition. And there is no antagonism at all when one wants to accept oneself as one is. Now that ought to be very clear.

In the second place, an 'I', being small, is, of course, not developed. We talk about feeding 'I'. We talk about an immature 'I' growing up. We talk about a certain period in which this 'I' starts to become functional. We also talk about the 'I' being divided, having parallel lines for development and having to go through a period of, I call it still, 'gestation,' before it could come down to Earth in participation of that what is our ordinary unconscious behavior. Now it is obvious when a thing of that kind, which still has to grow and is dependent partly on your own wish and also partly on the grace of the Lord, because I've said several times that this 'I' is filled with life coming from Above and that all I can do with my wish in an unconscious state, even purified as much as I can make it, is to create an entity, praying to God then to fill it and let it be functioning. That if then Work; by Work on myself, I mean 'I' is Working in observing me, my personality - as it is - and accepting it.

Now the three requirements are: observation by this 'I' - which is the same as the presence of this 'I', emotionally explained - and taking in the fact that I exist. That is Observation. The second is a receiving of information about me which are, in the case of a mental 'I', recorded; which are, in the case of an emotional 'I', judged. They belong to that what is an emotional 'I', wishing a man to be what he is and not rationalizing about himself and free from his own interpretation when that what is needed is the fact of one's own existence, also emotionally expressed. And the third, of course, is the question of time, which in our ordinary mind causes us to have associative values which spoil our thought, and which in our ordinary feeling center relate to the fact that the nerve nodes are not united in one's heart. Now it is so obvious that this 'I', when it starts to function in the beginning, is not only immature but cannot function. That is, it only can function for one Moment and we have used the word 'Awareness' for that; indicating that in the sense of time an awareness is not as yet a state of Awakening which I wished 'I' could be - constantly awake and constantly present to me. So I already

indicate that there is a certain possibility of growth from something I call awareness to an end product which I call Awakened state. So that when this 'I' starts to function it is of course only a little bit compared to what it ought to be.

Now we make a distinction again between quality and quantity. From the standpoint of quality, an 'I', as 'I', small as it may be, is impartial and functions simultaneously. That one can say. From the standpoint of growth of an 'I', there is very little quantity. The problem is to keep the quality and to increase the quantity - which two factors are independent of each other. I've explained that the other day. When I say there is a ray of Light in a darkness - I've said several times that that is different from a so-called 'ray of Darkness' in the midst of Light, because one is positive, the other is the absence of Light. But when I talk about twilight - a distance in time between midnight and midday - there is a constant addition until midday is reached. And of course there is an addition in what you might call percentage-wise of a little 'I', growing up, becoming more and more in quantity impartial. Of course, quality is always there, but it's not useful and it is silly to say, 'impartial, yes or no?' It is utter nonsense. There is nothing that is immediately born totally like the thoughts in the head of Zeus. They don't exist for us. There is a slow process of growth. And it applies to the quantity and it applies to the time, because when a moment is expanded so that then a state of Awareness can take place, it means that there is a duration of the maintenance of Awareness. And then when that time element, indicated by that kind of a growth, is eliminated, then of course 'I' is mature.

So don't make a mistake and don't lead them astray. The attempts at Work, not only because the little 'I' is small and it takes time for that to grow up, is, of course, impure and it is also impure because the attempts we make are impure. What do I know when I say to the little 'I' - 'observe me-impartially'? What do I know about impartiality? What do I know about simultaneity - as an experience - than only perhaps a Moment. All along the line, I try to build this 'I' up to the best

of my knowledge. And my knowledge in the beginning is 99 percent mechanical and subjective; and the results are also exactly the same. And the impartiality is also 99 percent as an attempt but still remaining subjective, not impartial as it really ought to be - than one little percent. And that the constant effort for me to reach an understanding of Infinity as expressed by a Moment is that I gradually have to disassociate in my mind all concepts which have to do with time.

Time expressed for my mind is only the future and the past. I've said when it goes through me as a stream of time - this 'Unique subjectivity is only realizable as a subjective something of me, belonging to me, when the present is reached and goes over into the past. It is only when the time, as it were, hits me at a certain moment that then in that presence of myself I could recognize Heropass. You see I lost even the word 'time' for it. I say Moment - we can understand that. What was it for God? Heropass - as a new word, as a concept, free, much more free from the dimensions of Time which we are little bit familiar with.

Impartiality - it's exactly the same - free from form; free from space dimensions. That is what is impartial. And how can I - with my limitations in my mind and in my feeling - how can I, at such a time, be really 100 percent? Of course, it's impossible and everybody knows it.

The third reason it is difficult is that God does not allow it. God is the instigator, with one's Magnetic Center, that an 'I' should be created. And for that reason one asks that God will be present - or some higher form of energy to enter into me to give me help. It means that this Magnetic Center now being encased and imprisoned is crying for a wish, crying as a wish to be set free. It takes a long time for this 'I', as the prince, I've called it, the prince of royal blood, to wake up the sleeping beauty.

You have to understand that this kind of a road that one has to travel, from the surface, through one's Essence - to the Essential Essence quality, must take - in our terminology - time and experience. And that is why God protects us. So it

is impossible for us at any moment now to understand 100 percent impartiality and 100 percent simultaneity. That is the one side of it, because if we did, we killed ourselves-- we would--we cannot stand to see ourselves as we are. The second reason is that Mother Nature still has something to say about it. She is not going to allow an impartiality to be understood, even in the very beginning and as far as the time element is concerned, Mother Nature says 'you just take your time, I know what it is to live as an unfortunate planet.'

So you see, there are so many reasons why one has to be much clearer about what is this impartiality. What is it when one says 1 percent, 2 percent, 3 percent? It is the indication of growth, only. It is the possibility for a person to become familiar with such terms and such experiences so that, because of this, gradually the influence of an Objective faculty can start to assert itself as one grows in the development of 'I'. And that gradually for a person he becomes more and more acquainted with himself as he is. And having to admit that he is what he is when it is observed by means of 'I' and that then he will be able to stand it. When he is confronted with it in the beginning, he doesn't want to see it; and he substitutes all kind of 'ersatz.' But when gradually it becomes clear to him that a fact is a fact, then he can learn to accept it. How difficult is it to accept the death of someone? You don't want to believe it because you still see the form walking. And when you see a dead face, as a corpse, you still imagine it is alive because you cannot understand with your mind, neither with your feeling, that such a fact is absolute. And we have no means, as yet, in our feeling, and gradually, perhaps, getting it with an emotional development, but there is no question about our unconscious mind not being able to have any understanding of an absolute value.

That is why we quarrel all the time, because there is no universal language of that kind. You see, mistakes of this kind, which do happen, do not help a person. You cannot just say, 'I'm sorry, I don't understand that of you.' You have to learn to give an indication of what is meant when a person says 'I have a religious feeling,

but I cannot connect it yet with this observation process.' Why is 'I' to be described only as a little bit of a mind? Why can't it be explained as having another phase which is emotional? - of interest? Even for a work of art that I create, I have interest because I have given it my life. And of course I love it. And I wished it could - could love me - because if I want that to become a guide, why should this 'I' even bother about me unless this 'I' cares for me?

So when a person, because of his earlier bringing up - or perhaps even the present conditions - has a certain religious feeling about himself which he cannot really place - what are we trying to do? To give a conduct for a man, not only with his mind, but as a man - in which he becomes harmonious; in which the three or four different directions of his ordinary development can be combined; of which the fourth one, the religious attitude, is the most important because it has to do with his real emotional life and his inner Life, where all desires will start for a possible development of a man. An inner Life sets off the potentialities in the right direction, but you must make sure that that direction is understood. And when a person is religious and perhaps does not want to put certain words to this A-B-C, leave it alone. Simply tell him, "Keep on," if you can understand. How will you reach knowledge of yourself? If you are associating all kind of other thoughts of your ordinary mind with it, you know well enough that it will not get you very far. But if you can take yourself as you are, if you can become more acquainted, if you can see yourself as perhaps God sees you - at a distance - but loves you - if that is an understanding of your religion. If there is within you a desire of wishing to be free - something that you call bondage of the Earth, isn't that enough to create in you a feeling of religiousness?

If one makes an attempt and at certain times has a so-called 'successful' result of a realization of one's existence in which then the bondage for one moment has fallen away - the resultant for oneself is a state in which one knows that one is. And then, in that kind of a freedom, it is something that one experiences out-

of-this-world and not knowing even how to describe it. Why can't religion enter into attempts of being Conscious? What is it that I want my mind to be? When I say it wants to have absolute facts, it means it wants to have an understanding of a Law. It wants to be able to see a Law as certain things must function. And I am willing to yield to that Law when I know that it belongs to the Totality of all Life.

The mind is not just by itself when it still can allow the Lights of Karatas. Why not talk about that as a religious attitude? Why does Gurdjieff talk about mentation, impartial, the mountainpass? What was it somewhere, a woman who once only wanted to know - she had heard a little bit of this and that - and it was all too mental. The answer is read ALL AND EVERYTHING and see if it is mental. Thousands of examples are there of human beings behaving in a certain way; and quite definitely emotional. Do you think that Makary Kronbernkzion was not happy with what he had written? Do you think that Hamelinadir, when he shouts, has not an emotional state? Do you think that Ashiata Shiemash just did for mental functioning - to go up on the mountain? Such nonsense. But tell people; and simply show. If a person doesn't understand what it is and wants this and that and the other, tell them it's not for them. Tell him, 'Work. If you want to find something, you have to hunt for it. It's not going to be given.'

These little things creep in when you talk. Don't talk too long about repetition of the same thing more or less by adding things that, as I say, are much too confusing. Hit the point when it is necessary to say this, "Yes, it is. The right road is this. The right road is when you walk and there is something that is with you and observes you, is present to you. Is that there, yes or no? Do you have that kind of an experience?" And if the answer is, "No, I don't," when you are honest, you say, "It's not right as yet, try. You are not on the right road." They are confused in their mind and you have to explain the right road. It is not that direction. That leads to chaos. It leads to a lot of descriptions of an ordinary kind with a little bit of something that is a little different without

any guarantee that that difference is Objective.

Define Objectivity. Out of this world, one says. Non-subjectivity. Something that can be when one is in activity with the body - certain things, give them a task. Listen to their voice over the telephone. When they answer the phone before, tell them to wait, then stretch out their hand, then get hold of that telephone instrument - then lift it up, then wait for a moment before they say 'Hello' and maybe tell them to use the word, 'Hüh, yes. Oh! ' All kind of ways to answer a telephone if they want to hear themselves. If they want to Work, they can find different ways and means all together for themselves out of daily life, the way they are. Sitting on the edge of the bed, that's all. Let them start. Don't tell them, in the beginning, to do at a certain time certain things, they don't even know what to do. They don't know what you are talking about sometimes, they have no idea. They're not looking for anything that you've told them. You don't tell them enough. Where is 'I'? Try to explain it if you can, as an entity, I say, again, out of this world, a something that is Objective. What is Objective? Freedom. Impartial. You understand simultaneity. You understand a moment. Do you know what could be meant by something happening and registering at that same time, without time lost? Try to explain a little bit, impartiality. Why not impartiality? Why wait til 9, 10, 11 o'clock? Right there; get up in the morning when the alarm clock goes off and you stretch out your arm and yeah you push that little button to stop it and something in you is then a little bit awake. Why don't you tell them sometimes - sit up right away in bed. Get your feet out - maybe it's cold. Put your slippers on and then, if you really want to wake up, take them off again.

Why don't you tell them simple things instead of confusing them and going along with their particular way of philosophy and thinking? It is of no use, I assure you. I've said it before, don't use the tapes that we have talked about in the last five or six hundred. They contain information of different kinds. In the beginning - these were the tapes - so simple. I try to establish a language at that time with

lots of tasks, many. Someone counted them up, we got to over three or four hundred different kind of tasks. And it's all there in tapes. It's all there in your own brain. It's all there in your own experience - if you have tried to Work. If you know the difficulties that were in your way, you can tell them about that, but you can incorporate it in something that most likely will be the same kind of a thing for them. Then tell them and make a meeting short if you want to, but make it to the point, exact. And when you talk afterwards, tell each other, for God's sake, that they made a mistake. Have the strength of your opinion. Don't go along and try to justify it. That is not Work, not even among yourselves. These groups have to become really much more exact. I say also, much - much shorter, if you like. But in any event, don't hesitate - if you know a little bit about Work yourself - when it is wrong on the part of someone who asks a question. The statement that was made by one of us last night - so completely wrong, asking a question, fighting against his unconscious state. Such nonsense that you let it go.

Why do I say these kind of things in this kind of a tone? Why is it so difficult to study enough? Read ALL AND EVERYTHING. You'll find there, beautifully expressed, certain words, so - so carefully chosen as words. That was root language - language, I've called it before, the same way as sometimes in the music. That simplicity of music that has to be there almost, I would say, without personal interpretation. Just as music, and not necessarily even the way de Hartmann sometimes wanted to play it because de Hartmann was a so-called musician, very able and capable, but he was not Gurdjieff. Don't ever make a mistake about that. It is so difficult to get free from interpretations of such things. Music - of course it's holy; simple.

Take the harmonium. That's melody. And it hits you. All such things one attack--one--one approaches with trepidation. One has to be so careful with Work and the explanations of it and the preparation for it and to see that you don't make over-statements. And that you criticize yourself afterwards - what was wrong with us today? Why wasn't there a level? Why couldn't we answer that woman in such a

way that she could go home with a satisfaction? Why was it that she kept on asking again and again about this and that? Was I clear to find out where she lived before I started to answer instead of just giving a little answer from the top of my head? Don't do such things to Gurdjieff. It isn't right. Gurdjieff was a master. He lived a life for the sake of giving. He wanted people to understand the bondage. He need not have done what he had done, what he has done, what he spent his time on. It was not necessary for him, not even, you might say, to write ALL AND EVERYTHING. He could have taken his accident as an omen so that he said, 'Well, I tried Prieure, too bad, I give up,' and then die, also in peace; he had done already a great deal.

What is it, the attitude that one should have towards Work? When you yourself know that Work has a meaning and it has already given you here and there certain indications and an insight of wisdom, of a knowledge which you would not have gotten some other way. That it has given you a chance to connect different things together so that the whole became much more a totality. The understanding of that what I wish. Why reduce? Give them a little bit of something, sitting with their eyes closed and so forth - instead of what they were trying to find out - it is the totality of themselves. Don't give them that kind of a nonsense then. What is the emphasis of Work? 'I'. I've said it time and time again. Is 'I' interested in my arm? Only when it leads to 'I' existing. And then it is impartial to my arm. It doesn't care about my eyes being closed or not. I wish awareness to take place in me, somewhere. I want the totality of me, as I am a human being, working in a certain way, behaving in a certain way, with characteristics, tendencies - when afterwards I have enough absolute facts to be able to see something of myself and knew that it is truthful and to come to an axiomatic law - not an interpretation in accordance with human nature or the rest of the animal or even the human kingdom. I have no interest in the rules of the Earth when I want to leave it. I want something that is of more permanent value to me. I want the totality of myself to

become an individual, not just my little finger. Choose your particular indications of what you want them to do, but keep on emphasizing: What is the aim? Not to have a little bit of an awareness, even. With what? Because they happen to exclude all the rest, because they close their eyes?

Of course I use these examples, I know that. But that is not regarding Work. I say turn off the switch on the electric light. Okidamokh, I say. Is that done with your little finger? That is done with all of you. When you say it and you realize that there was not supposed to be any waste and that you, yourself turned that switch off, happened to exist at that time, as a human being, and accepting yourself turning off a switch. The realization of that Truth will set Magnetic Center free. That is why it's so necessary I say again and again - an exact language, to try to understand each other a little bit more and a little bit better and really try to criticize when someone talks a little 'oo-oo-oo' like this. Why, when it isn't necessary? When the wrong words are used. Go in that direction a little further, a little beyond. God, I almost - excuse me - I throw up for such statements. They don't mean anything. You're Working. You sit. You tell. Move your hand, get up. Walk up and down; take an empty suitcase. I've said many times. Shake hands with a person a little longer so that there is a sensation maybe at that time and that can remind you, 'I am awake, can I be awake, so help me God, can I be awake?' The telephone, 'hello.' And with that, something in me is alive and I know it because I know, it is at that time it takes me up and it comes out through my mouth but it is emotional, some kind of aliveness in me and I know it is that way, and I accept it. That is the way I am then and why should I have any criticism about that expression of a form of my life?

I sit in a chair. I have a pipe. I smoke it. I light a match. There I sit. I lean back. Why can't I be aware at that time? What is so difficult with that? I sit and I smoke a pipe and it goes out and I light a match again. And can't I be aware of this body moving at that time when I have my one leg over the other and

I cross it the other way? Or when I want to get up and I get up in a chair, like that, can't I be aware of that? What is so difficult about that? Why go through all the different hallucinations and nonsensical talk? It's so simple. I drink coffee. There it is - coffee - my hand, I see. Don't I see this--this human creature drink coffee? Move something; I write. Certainly I have my mind with writing but I wait for a moment; then I realize I sit at a desk. This creature, sitting at a desk. I'm alive. And he moves his hand - sure, he is alive, but where is 'I'? Where is this Objective faculty? Constantly I wish to let it look at me; to become aware of me. To remain in a state of awakened Awakening. To be. To BE. I want my Being. I don't want three centers even. Can't one understand that kind of a idea of Work? And it is so simple, I keep on telling you, it is so simple.

It's simple now - you get up. I have to finish because that instrument tells me the time is over. And so I walk outside of you there and you sit and then you get up. Do me a favor. Do yourself a favor. You get up and try to wake up while you do it. See what you can do.

Have a good week.

Goodnight.

END TAPE

Transcribed: Ibbie Kenna
ROUGH: Jessica 1/9/71
1st proof: Hugh Swift
2nd proof: Lenore